

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 13 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 13 are amended to better distinguish over the prior art, and claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 11 and 12 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Swoboda (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,824). Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 11 and 12 are canceled. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. However, the rejection as applied to the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Swoboda does not disclose or suggest a microcomputer, including at least a first monitor that transfers data to and from a second monitor, the first monitor determines a combination of at least two primitive commands from a group consisting of a primitive read command, primitive write command, and primitive GO command to be executed according to the data received from the second monitor, and performs processing for executing the determined combination of the at least two primitive commands, the second monitor being provided outside the microcomputer for converting a debugging command into the combination of at the least two primitive commands, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 13.

Specifically, Swoboda discloses a method of operating an integrated circuit that has a target system debug interface.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Swoboda does not disclose or suggest a microcomputer, including at least a first monitor that transfers data to and from a second monitor, the first monitor determines a combination of at least two primitive commands from a group consisting of a primitive read command, primitive write command, and primitive GO command to be executed according to the data received from the second monitor, and

performs processing for executing the determined combination of the at least two primitive commands, the second monitor being provided outside the microcomputer for converting a debugging command into the combination of at the least two primitive commands. On the contrary, nowhere in the applied references are these features disclosed or suggested. Thus, Swoboda would have required a monitor program with a complicated routine to execute every debugging command. Moreover, it would not have been possible in Swoboda to make the order code size of the monitor program remarkably small. Finally, it would not have been possible in Swoboda to perform an on-chip debugging function with small hardware.

Accordingly, because Swoboda fails to disclose each and every feature as the claimed invention, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard S. Elias
Registration No. 48,806

JAO:RSE/eks

Date: July 28, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461